

**STATE FOREST LAND
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can. Highlighted questions are supplemental to the standard SEPA checklist. These questions look at the proposed project in relationship to the surrounding landscape. Adjacency and landscape/watershed-administrative-unit (WAU) maps for this proposal are available on the DNR internet website at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center." These maps may also be reviewed at the DNR regional office responsible for the proposal. This checklist is to be used for SEPA evaluation of state forest land activities.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later. All of the questions are intended to address the complete proposal as described by your response to question A-11. The proposal acres in question A-11 may cover a larger area than the attached forest practice application acres, or the actual timber sale acres.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON PROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer" and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Timber Sale Name: 3 RIVERS REHABAgreement #:30-0-74826
2. Name of applicant: Department of Natural Resources
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Olympic Region
411 Tillicum Lane
Forks, Wa. 98331

Contact Person: Jenny Garstang
Telephone #: (360) 374-6131
4. Date checklist prepared: 04/23/2003
5. Agency requesting checklist: Department of Natural Resources
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

a. Auction Date: 05/30/2004

b. Planned contract end date (but may be extended):

c. Phasing: N/A
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

Timber Sale

a.	Site preparation:	Logging slash will be piled and may be burned within 3 years after harvest.
b.	Regeneration Method:	Hand planting. Seedlings may include Douglas fir, Sitka spruce and Western hemlock Within the first planting season after harvest.
c.	Vegetation Management:	Hand slashing or other treatment alternatives will be assessed 3-6 years after harvest.
d.	Thinning:	Pre-commercial thinning needs will be assessed at about 12-14 years after planting. Commercial thinning may be assessed at about stand age 30-40 years.

Roads: Road maintenance needs including ditch clean out, grading and culvert repair or replacement will occur a needed during and after harvest operations for this project.

Rock Pits and/or Sale: Rock for this proposal will come from the DNR D-300 Rock Pit located about 0.8 mile South of the proposed sale site in the NE ¼ SW ¼, Sec. 21, T. 28 N., R. 14 W., W.M.

Other: Firewood cutting may be allowed after timber harvest operations are completed.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

X 303 (d) – listed water body in WAU: X temp ☐sediment ☐completed TMDL (total maximum daily load):
Landscape plan:
X Watershed analysis: **Sol Duc**
☐Interdisciplinary team (ID Team) report:
X Road design plan: **Plan available in the Olympic Region DNR Office**
☐Wildlife report:
☐Geotechnical report:
☐Other specialist report(s):
☐Memorandum of understanding (sportsmen’s groups, neighborhood associations, tribes, etc.):
X Rock pit plan: **Plan available in the Olympic Region DNR Office.**
X Other: **Final Forest Resource Plan (July 1992); Final Habitat Conservation Plan (September 1997); State Soil Survey; OESF Marbled Murrelet Habitat Model; the Forestry Handbook (August 1997); and Managing Wetlands on State Forest Lands in Washington (June 2000) .**

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

No.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

☐HPA ☒ Burning permit ☐Shoreline permit ☒ Incidental take permit ☒ Other: **Board of Natural Resources**

11. Give brief, complete description of our proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include specific information on project description.)

a. Complete proposal description:

This proposal is located within the area covered by the Sol Duc Watershed Analysis. The findings of the analysis are mainly targeted at activities near and adjacent to water resources, mass wasting, unstable ground and surface erosion. This proposal does not contain any terrain that is considered unstable or is susceptible to mass wasting. Several mitigation measures were taken with this proposal to address soil protection and wetland protection. These mitigation efforts are detailed throughout this document.

This proposed timber sale is located about 7 miles by road southwest of Forks, Washington in parts of Sections 16 and 21, Township 28 North, Range 14 West, W.M. on State Forest Board lands. This is a one unit sale within the Olympic Experimental State Forest (OESF) totaling approximately 47.46 acres. Of this 3.49 acres is a “Type A” wetland management zone and the other 43.97 acres is a regeneration harvest. The sale area is composed of 38 year old second growth poor quality mixed conifer timber with some hardwood also present. Harvest of this stand is occurring at an early age due to the low quality and high defect of the existing stand. There is approximately 970 MBF of timber volume to be removed from this proposal. Harvesting will be restricted to ground based operations with shovel or processor and forwarder type equipment to reduce ground disturbance. There will also be wet weather timing restrictions for harvest operations on the site. A 100 year site index buffer of 170 feet was left on the wetland along the eastern boundary of the proposal. As per OESF wetland management prescriptions this buffer will be thinned down to 120 square feet of basal area per acre. Larger healthy trees were marked within this area to obtain the 120 basal area per acre. No harvest activity will occur within approximately 25’ 30’ of the wetland edge.

b. Timber stand description pre-harvest (include major timber species and origin date), type of harvest, overall unit objectives.

Pre-Harvest Stand Description: **This proposal is a managed 38 year old stand of poor quality mixed conifer. Species include Douglas fir, western hemlock, Sitka spruce and western red cedar. There is scattered hardwood also present throughout the stand. Understory vegetation consists of vine maple clumps, sword ferns, salmonberry, salal and other minor brush species.**

Defect including multiple tops , twisted boles and various other defects is prevalent throughout this stand. This site was visited by staff from the departments Land Management Center and the decision was made that due to the high amount of defective trees we should harvest it at an early age and establish a new plantation.

Type of Harvest: **This will be a regeneration harvest using ground based harvest methods. Equipment will be limited to shovel or processor/forwarder operations. All logging slash will be required to be piled within the sale area**

Overall Unit Objectives:
Objectives for this proposal are to provide financial benefit to the State Forest Board trust under the guidelines provided by Forest Practice rules, the DNR’s Habitat Conservation Plan and the Sol Duc Watershed Analysis. Specific objectives include establishing a healthy stand of conifer on this site, wetland protection, green tree retention plan, protection of soil quality and procedures pertaining to threatened and endangered species. Wetland protection has been designed for a Type A wetland along the eastern boundary of this proposal in accordance with Forest Practice rules and HCP OESF wetland procedures.

This sale will have scattered individually marked retention trees and clumped retention trees. Retention efforts were targeted at well formed healthy trees to further help the future stand quality on this site.

Contract language and equipment limitations will help to reduce soil impacts. Harvesting will be limited to shovel logging or processor/forwarder. Harvest operations will be suspended during periods of weather conditions when rutting may occur.

This sale was determined to be non-suitable marbled murrelet habitat and conforms to the OESF’s long term murrelet strategy. The sale area is located within the Colby Creek/Dickey River spotted owl circle and is consistent with the DNR’s HCP long term strategies for managing in and around Northern spotted owl habitat.

c. Road activity summary. See also attached forest practice application (FPA) for maps and more details.

Type of Activity	How Many	Length (feet) (Estimated)	Acres (Estimated)	Fish Barrier Removals (#)
Construction		181	0.2	0
Reconstruction		480		0
Maintenance		0		0
Abandonment		0	0	0
Bridge Install/Replace	0			0
Culvert Install/Replace (fish)	0			0
Culvert Install/Replace (no fish)	0			

12. Location of proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist. (See attached timber sale map. See also color landscape/WAU map on the DNR website under “SEPA Center.”)

a. Legal description:

Parts of SW ¼ SW ¼, Section 16, T. 28 N., R. 14 W.
Parts of N ½ NW ¼, Section 21, T. 28 N., R. 14 W.

b. Distance and direction from nearest town (include road names): This proposal is located approximately 7 miles southwest of Forks, Washington. .

c. Identify the watershed administrative unit (WAU), the WAU Sub-basin(s), and acres. (See also landscape/WAU map on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “ SEPA Center.”)

WAU Name	WAU Acres	Proposal Acres
SOL DUC LOWLANDS	21006	47.46

13. Discuss any known future activities not associated with this proposal that may result in a cumulative change in the environment when combined with the past and current proposal(s). (See digital ortho-photos for WAU and adjacency maps on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center” for a broader landscape perspective.)

This proposal is located within the Sol Duc Lowlands WAU of the Sol Duc Watershed Analysis area. The findings of the analysis are mainly targeted at activities near and adjacent to water resources, mass wasting, unstable ground and erosion. This proposal has a Type A wetland adjacent to the east boundary which resulted in protective measures being enacted to mitigate any impacts to the wetland area.

This proposal is located within the Sol Duc Lowlands WAU of the Sol Duc Watershed Anaylsis area. This WAU has mixed forestland ownership with the major landowner being large industrial private landowners. The Department of Natural Resources has forestland ownership checker boarded throughout the WAU. There are scattered residences and small private holdings throughout the WAU as well. The DNR has approximately 4,326 acres of ownership in the WAU, which equates to 19% of the total land in the WAU. Over the past seven years the DNR has harvested approximately 286 acres in regeneration harvests and 180 acres in partial cut harvests within the WAU. Approximately 97 acres of DNR ownership within approximately 1 to 2 miles of this proposal have seen regeneration harvest within the past 2 – 6 years. There is currently a sold DNR timber sale of approximately 53 acres located 1 to 2 miles to the northwest of this site. Over the past 5 – 10 years private industrial forestlands within the WAU have reached rotation age and are currently being harvested on an estimated rotation age of 40 – 50 years in accordance with the Sol Duc Watershed Analysis. Most of the private forestland is on its second to third harvest rotation. DNR timber stands located within 1 to 2 miles of this proposal are currently classed as modeled murrelet habitat under the OESF’s long term murrelet strategy procedures. These stands will be surveyed for murrelet occupancy in the future and future harvest will be dependant on the outcome of these surveys. DNR has no immediate plans of any future harvest plans at this time within this WAU.

The area of this proposal is located within the boundaries of the Olympic Experimental State Forest, which has specific riparian, spotted owl and marbled murrelet conservation strategies, which are managed under the departments Habitat Conservation Plan. This proposal is located within the area covered by the Sol Duc Watershed Analysis and no conditions exist on this site which trigger prescriptions addressed in the watershed analysis. Several mitigation measures were applied to this proposal that will help to reduce future cumulative effect issues that may have lead to cumulative effects. It is located on flat ground in an area of very stable soil conditions. Approximately 181 feet, of new road construction and 480 feet of existing road reconstruction is planned. There are no water resources associated with this road construction and these spurs will be abandoned upon completion of use. There is a Type A wetland located along the eastern boundary which has been protected with a 170’ wetland management zone as per HCP wetland management prescriptions. This management zone will be thinned down to 120 square feet of basal area per acre. No activity will occur within 25’ of the wetland edge. Contract language will prohibit the use of equipment that may pose high risk to soil compaction and will suspend operations during periods of wet weather when rutting may occur. Retention of live green trees have been left aggregated and dispersed throughout the sale area to facilitate large woody debris content to the forest floor over time, provide habitat for different wildlife species and to lessen the aesthetic impacts to the site. This proposal is located within, the Colby Creek/ Dickey River owl circle, which is a status 4 circle. This harvest is consistent with the HCP’s rate of harvest and has been designed to be consistent with procedural guidance concerning activities within spotted owl circles. The SEPA adjacency maps show two stands of older

timber near this proposal, one along the northwestern boundary and one along the southern boundary. These two stands have been modeled murrelet habitat by the OESF marbled murrelet model. These sites have been surveyed and no murrelets have been found. The proposal itself was considered to be non-murrelet habitat by the model and conforms to the OESF’s long term murrelet strategy.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (check one):

☒ Flat, ☐ Rolling, ☐ Hilly, ☐ Steep Slopes, ☐ Mountainous, ☐ Other:

1) General description of the WAU or sub-basin(s) (landforms, climate, elevations, and forest vegetation zone).

The Sol Duc Lowlands WAU is generally moderate terrain with an elevation range of 39 to 1,830 feet with the average being 451 feet. The average precipitation in the WAU is approximately 115 inches per year. The major timber type in the WAU is Western hemlock. There are a total of 22,394 acres in the WAU with 4,326 acres of DNR ownership.

2) Identify any difference between the proposal location and the general description of the WAU or sub-basin(s).

The proposed location is in the lower elevation range of the WAU with an average elevation of 70 feet.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? Less than 10%.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland. Note: The following table is created from state soil survey data. It is a roll-up of general soils information for the soils found in the entire sale area. It is only one of several site assessment tools used in conjunction with actual site inspections for slope stability concerns or erosion potential. It can help indicate potential for shallow, rapid soil movement, but often does not represent deeper soil sub-strata. The actual soils conditions in the sale area may vary considerably based on land-form shapes, presence of erosive situations, and other factors. The state soil survey is a compilation of various surveys with different standards.

State Soil Survey #	Soil Texture or Soil Complex Name	% Slope	Acres	Mass Wasting Potential	Erosion Potential
6400	SILT LOAM	0-5	45	INSIGNIFICANT	LOW
7435	V.GRAVELLY SANDY LOAM	0-5	2.4	INSIGNIFICANT	LOW

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

1) Surface indications:

There are no indications in the vicinity of this proposal.

2) Is there evidence of natural slope failures in the sub-basin(s)?

☐ No ☒ Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:

There is some evidence of natural slope failures in the steeper, higher areas of the WAU. These are generally associated with steep stream channels and headwalls. None of these areas are found within the immediate area of the proposal. There are potentially areas like these located within 2-5 miles of the proposal.

3) Are there slope failures in the sub-basin(s) associated with timber harvest activities or roads?

☐ No ☒ Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:

There is evidence of slope failures within the WAU associated with timber harvest. These are primarily road failures associated with poor road construction techniques, road location and maintenance issues.

4) Is the proposed site similar to sites where slope failures have occurred previously in the sub-basin(s)?

☒ No ☐ Yes, describe similarities between the conditions and activities on these sites:

No, this proposal is located on flat ground and has no features associated with it that would pose a risk to slope failure.

5) Describe any slope stability protection measures (including sale boundary location, road, and harvest system decisions) incorporated into this proposal

Does not apply.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Approx. acreage new roads: 0.3 Acre. Approx. acreage new landings: 1.0 Acre. Approx. acreage rock pit fills: 0 Acres
Fill source: 0

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

A small amount of incidental erosion could occur during the course of timber harvesting and road construction.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)? Approximate percent of proposal in permanent road running surface (includes gravel roads):

Approximately 3%.

- h. Propose measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:
(Include protection measures for minimizing compaction or rutting.)

This proposal is located within the area covered by the Sol Duc Watershed Analysis which targets mass wasting, activities adjacent to water resources, surface erosion and slope instability. There are no areas on this proposal which triggered prescriptions from this analysis. The proposal is consistent with guidelines provided by Forest Practice rules and the DNR’s Habitat Conservation Plan. In addition contract language will prohibit yarding operations during periods of wet weather or wet soil conditions when rutting may occur, roads will be abandoned upon completion of harvest and the site will be promptly reforested.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust from truck traffic, rock mining, crushing or hauling, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Insignificant amounts of engine exhaust from logging equipment and dust from vehicles will occur. Logging slash, if burned, will be burnt adhering to the States Smoke Management Guidelines.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

None.

3. Water

- a. Surface:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into. (See attached timber sale map and forest practice base maps.)

Yes. There is a “Type A” wetland located along the eastern boundary of the proposal. This wetland appears to be an historic meandor of the Sol Duc River, however it does not drain into the river.

- a) Downstream water bodies:

None

- b) Complete the following riparian & wetland management zone table:

Wetland, Stream, Lake, Pond, or Saltwater Name (if any)	Water Type	Number (how many?)	Avg RMZ/WMZ Width in Feet (per side for streams)
Wetland	Type A	1	170 feet

- c) List RMZ/WMZ protection measures including silvicultural prescriptions, road-related RMZ/WMZ protection measures, and wind buffers.

This wetland has been protected with a 170’ WMZ. This management zone will be thinned down to 120 square feet of basal area per acre . No harvest activities or equipment will be allowed to operate within 25’ – 30’ of the wetland edge.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) to the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
☐No ☒ Yes (See RMZ/WMZ table above and attached timber sale map.)
Description (include culverts):

See 1) c) above for protection measures and description of activities within the WMZ .

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

None.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. (Include diversions for fish-passage culvert installation.)
☒ No ☐ Yes, description:

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
☒ No ☐ Yes, describe location:
- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.
☒ No ☐ Yes, type and volume:
- 7) Does the sub-basin contain soils or terrain susceptible to surface erosion and/or mass wasting? What is the potential for eroded material to enter surface water?
- The State Soil Survey indicates the soils in this proposal have insignificant mass wasting potential and the erosion potential is low.**
- 8) Is there evidence of changes to the channels in the WAU and sub-basin(s) due to surface erosion or mass wasting (accelerated aggradations, erosion, decrease in large organic debris (LOD), change in channel dimensions)?
☐ No ☒ Yes, describe changes and possible causes:
- There is some evidence of changes to stream channels on some streams within the WAU due to both natural and human caused events. Most are located in the higher elevations of the WAU on steep terrain.**
- 9) Could this proposal affect water quality based on the answers to the questions 1-8 above?
☐ No ☒ Yes, explain:
This proposal is consistent with the Sol Duc Watershed Analysis and the HCP's OESF wetland procedures., This proposal is expected to have minimal to no effect on water quality due to protection measures listed in B1h above.
- 10) What are the approximate road miles per square mile in the WAU and sub-basin(s)?
- There are 3.1 miles of road per section in the WAU. It is estimated that approximately 20% of these carry water during the winter and spring months.**
- Are you aware of areas where forest roads or road ditches intercept sub-surface flow and deliver surface water to streams, rather than back to the forest floor?
☒ No ☐ Yes, describe:
- No examples can be pinpointed at this time, however it is likely that some roads within the WAU do intercept sub-surface flow and do indeed deliver ditchwater into streams. However in recent years road construction and maintenance practices have addressed this concern and are making efforts to place ditch water onto stable forest floors.**
- 11) Is the proposal within a significant rain-on-snow (ROS) zone? If not, **STOP HERE** and go to question B-3-a-13 below. Use the WAU or sub-basin(s) for the ROS percentage questions below.
☒ No ☐ Yes, approximate percent of WAU in significant ROS zone.
Approximate percent of sub-basin(s):
- 12) If the proposal is within the significant ROS zone, what is the approximate percentage of the WAU or sub-basin(s) within the significant ROS zone (all ownerships) that is (are) rated as hydrologically mature?
- 13) Is there evidence of changes to channels associated with peak flows in the WAU or sub-basin(s)?
☐ No ☒ Yes, describe observations:
- The Sol Duc Watershed Analysis identifies several larger drainages originating on Forest Service land in the Upper Sol Duc WAU, well over 20 miles upriver of this proposal that have experienced some past increase to peak flows, again these were contributed to past harvest practices in the higher elevations. The analysis also shows that the main stem of the Sol Duc has not experienced any increase to peak flows and has not been impacted by the sub-basins mentioned above.**
- 14) Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-13 above, describe whether and how this proposal, in combination with other past, current, or reasonably foreseeable proposals in the WAU and sub-basin(s), may contribute to a peak flow impact.
- Based on the findings of the Sol Duc Watershed Analysis and the mitigation measures taken on this proposal this proposal should not significantly contribute to potential future peak flow issues.**
- 15) Is there water resource (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or downslope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in surface water amounts, quality, or movements as a result of this proposal?
☒ No ☐ Yes, possible impacts:
- 16) Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-15 above, note any protection measures addressing possible peak flow/flooding impacts.
- This proposal is expected to have no noticeable impact on peak flow or flooding in this WAU. Refer to B1h above for mitigation factors applied**

- b. Ground Water:
- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
- No.**
- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.
- Does not apply.**
- 3) Is there a water resource use (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or down slope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in groundwater amounts, timing, or movements as a result this proposal?
- ☒ No ☐ Yes, describe:
- a) Note protection measures, if any.
- None.**
- c. Water Runoff (including storm water):
- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.
- Storm water in the vicinity of this proposal will be absorbed into the forest floor as the site is basically flat and there is little opportunity for run off to occur.**
- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.
- No**
- a) Note protection measures, if any.
- The timber sale contract language prohibits operational activities and maintenance of harvest equipment that might result in this possibility. As noted above there is a buffer area adjacent to the wetland and limited activities in the wetland management zone.**
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:
- (See surface water, ground water, and water runoff sections above, questions B-3-a-1-c, B-3-a-16, B-3-b-3-a, and B-3-c-2-a.)**

4. Plants

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:
- X** deciduous tree: **X** alder, **X** maple,
X evergreen tree: **X** Douglas fir, **X** western hemlock, **X** Sitka spruce,**X** red cedar
X shrubs: **X** huckleberry, **X** salmonberry, **X** salal,
X grass
- X** wet soil plants: **X** devil's club,
- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? (See answers to questions A-11-a, A-11-b, B-3-a-1-b and B-3-a-1-c. The following sub-questions merely supplement those answers.)
- This proposal involves the harvest of approximately 970 MBF of mixed conifer timber.**
- 1) Describe the species, age, and structural diversity of the timber types immediately adjacent to the removal area.
- (See landscape/WAU and adjacency maps on the DNR website at: <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center.")**
- The SEPA ortho photo adjacency map for this proposal shows timber and other vegetation and young stand characteristics surrounding this site. The following descriptions will help explain and detail the maps description and legend:**
The proposal is partially bounded to the north by a 5 year old DNR plantation and a DNR second-growth plantation similar in characteristics and age as to the proposal. To the west of the proposal is a stand of 80 year old DNR timber and private residential land. To the south is a 20 year old DNR plantation and a stand of DNR owned 80 year old timber. To the east is a Type A wetland with similar aged timber located beyond the wetland.
- 2) Retention tree plan:
- Eight trees per acre have been left and mainly dispersed with a few clumps throughout the proposed unit. The marked leave trees targeted the larger and better formed trees within the stand.**
- c. List threatened or endangered plant species known to be on or near the site.

TSU Number	FMU_ID	Common Name	Federal Listing Status	WA State Listing Status
None Found in Database Search				

- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

Eight trees per acre have been left dispersed and aggregated throughout the sale area. The sale area will be promptly reforested with native conifer species upon completion of harvest.

5. Animal

- a. Circle or check any birds animals or unique habitats which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: ☒ hawk, ☐ heron, ☒ eagle, ☒ songbirds, ☒ pigeon,
mammals: ☒ deer, ☒ bear, ☒ elk, ☐ beaver,
fish: ☐ bass, ☐ salmon, ☐ trout, ☐ herring, ☐ shellfish, ☐ other:
unique habitats: ☐ talus slopes, ☐ caves, ☐ cliffs, ☐ oak woodlands, ☐ balds, ☐ mineral springs

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site (include federal- and state-listed species).

TSU Number	FMU_ID	Common Name	Federal Listing Status	WA State Listing Status
1	39521	SPOTTED OWL: Site:995-COLBY CREEK - DICKEY RIVER	THREATENED	ENDANGERED
1	39521	BALD EAGLE	THREATENED	THREATENED

- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

☒ Pacific flyway ☐ Other migration route: Explain if any boxes checked:

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

1) Note existing or proposed protection measures, if any, for the complete proposal described in question A-11.

Dispersed and some clumped leave trees will provide structure for many wildlife species to use. The density of leave trees will average eight trees per acre for the proposal area. These retention trees will provide an avenue towards a more diverse multi layered stand in the future. Snags and down wood will also be provided. The new open cover type created by the harvest will enhance foraging opportunities for some wildlife species. The sale has been designed to be consistent with the procedural guidance concerning activities in NSO circles and conforms to the OESF’s long term murrelet strategy.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project’s energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Does not apply.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

Does not apply.

7. Environmental Health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

Minimum hazard incidental to operating heavy machinery. Harvest operations will increase the risk of fire for a period of time. Contract language and State burning rules will require operations to be performed in a manner that will reduce the risk of fire. Fire suppression tools and equipment will be made readily available on site.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Does not apply.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Does not apply.

- b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?
Does not apply.
- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from this site.
Noise will be created by logging equipment and log haul operations during the daylight hours.
- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:
None.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? (Site includes the complete proposal, e.g. rock pits and access roads.)
Forestland.
- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.
No.
- c. Describe any structures on the site.
None.
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?
No.
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
Forestland.
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
Resource production.
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
Does not apply.
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally sensitive” area? If so, specify.
No.
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? **None**
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
None.
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
Does not apply.
- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:
The proposed harvest activity is compatible with the land use designation.

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
Does not apply.
- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
Does not apply.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:
Does not apply.

10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principle exterior building material(s) proposed?

Does not apply.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

- 1) Is this proposal visible from a residential area, town, city, developed recreation site, or a scenic vista?
☒ No ☐ Yes, viewing location:
- 2) Is this proposal visible from a major transportation or designated scenic corridor (county road, state or interstate highway, US route, river, or Columbia Gorge SMA)?
☒ No ☐ Yes, scenic corridor name:
- 3) How will this proposal affect any views described in 1) or 2) above?

Does not apply.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

An average of eight trees per acre have been left aggregated and dispersed throughout the proposal area. The sale area will be promptly reforested upon completion of harvest.

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

Does not apply.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

Does not apply.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

Does not apply.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

Does not apply.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

Informal uses for hunting, berry picking and access to parking spots for fishermen.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe:

No.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

None.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

No.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

Does not apply.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:
(Include all meetings or consultations with tribes, archaeologists, anthropologists or other authorities.)

None.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

This proposal is accessed by State Highway 101, the La Push County road and the D-3000 DNR management road.

- 1) Is it likely that this proposal will contribute to an existing safety, noise, dust, maintenance, or other transportation impact problem(s)?

No.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Does not apply.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

Does not apply.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

Yes, approximately 181 feet of new construction and 480 feet of reconstruction is planned for this sale. These roads will be abandoned upon completion of harvest.

- 1) How does this proposal impact the overall transportation system/circulation in the surrounding area, if at all?

There will not be any impact on the current transportation system.

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

Approximately 10 –12 trips per day during peak harvest activity.

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

None.

15. Public Services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

Does not apply.

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

Does not apply.

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

Does not apply.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Completed by: Mike Potter Date: 6/1/03 Title Forester 2